

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: Alt & Witzig Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					80

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotechnical operator  
Date: 4/27/06 (Supr)

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: CTL Engineering Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2	2	5	10
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					30

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotechnical Operations

Date: 1/27/06

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: Chicago Testing Laboratory Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	1	10	10
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2	2	5	10
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	40

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

*Nasir Siddiki*  
 Title: *Geotech Operations*  
 Date: *1/27/06* (Supv)

## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No.21

Consultant Name: Fuller, Mossbarger, Scott & May Engrs. Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable innovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable innovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2	0	5	0
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0			
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					20

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotech Operations  
 Date: 1/27/06 (Supr)

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No.21

Consultant Name: Earth Exploration, Inc. Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
Location	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					60

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Nauyar Siddik  
 Title: Geotech. Operations  
 Date: 1/27/01 (supv)

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: H. C. Nutting Services Description: Geotechnical.

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	+		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					80

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotech. Operations  
Date: 1/27/06 (Supv)

# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No.21

Consultant Name: K & S Engineers Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	1	10	10
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	0	5	0
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					40

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.21

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotechnical Engineer  
Date: 1/27/06 (SVP)



# Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: Patriot Engineering Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	1	20	20
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	2	15	30
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2			
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0	2	5	10
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2			
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1	2	10	20
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	2	5	10
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
Weighted Total					90

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title: Geotech Operations  
Date: 1/27/06 (Supv)



## Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21

Consultant Name: QORE, Inc.      Services Description: Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	0	5	0
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	0	10	0
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
				Weighted Total	-5

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

Title:

Date:

*Nancy Suddeth*  
*Geotechnical Operations*  
*4/27/16*

**Selection Rating for RFP- No. 05-02 , Item No. 21**

**Consultant Name:** Wang Engineering      **Services Description:** Geotechnical

Category	Scoring Criteria	Scale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Disputes	Outstanding Agreement Disputes.		0		
	No outstanding unresolved agreement disputes > 3 mos. old.	0		20	0
	Outstanding unresolved agreement disputes more than 3 mos. old.	-3			
Past Performance	Historical Performance.				
	Timeliness score from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on similar work from performance database.	*		15	0
	Quality/Budget score on all INDOT work from performance database.	*		10	0
Capacity of Team to do Work	Evaluation of the team's personnel and equipment to perform the project on time.				
	Availability of more than adequate capacity that results in added value to INDOT.	1	0	20	0
	Adequate capacity to meet the schedule.	0			
	Insufficient available capacity to meet the schedule.	-3			
Team's Demonstrated Qualifications	Technical expertise: Unique Resources & Equipment that yield a relevant added value or efficiency to the deliverable.				
	Demonstrated unique expertise and resources identified for req'd services for value added benefit.	2	0	15	0
	Expertise and resources at appropriate level.	0			
	Insufficient expertise and/or resources.	-3			
Project Manager	Rating of predicted ability to manage the project, based on: experience in size, complexity, type, subs, documentation skills.				
	Demonstrated experience in similar type and complexity.	2	2	5	10
	Experience in similar type and complexity shown in resume.	0			
	Experience in different type or lower complexity.	-1			
	Insufficient experience.	-3			
	Historical Performance of Firm's Project Management from database.	*		5	0
Approach to Project	Understanding and Innovation that gives INDOT cost and/or time savings.				
	High level of understanding and viable inovative ideas proposed.	2	2	10	20
	High level of understanding and/or viable inovative ideas proposed.	1			
	Basic understanding of the Project.	0			
	Lack of project understanding.	-3			
Location	Location of assigned staff to office relative to project.				
	Within 15 mi.	2			
	16 to 50 mi.	1			
	51 to 150 mi.	0	-1	5	-5
	151 to 500 mi.	-1			
	Greater than 500 mi.	-2			
	For 100% state funded agreements, non-Indiana firms.	-3			
<b>Weighted Total</b>					<b>25</b>

See guidelines for this RFP to determine the scale criteria.

The scores assigned above represent my best judgement of the consultant's abilities for the rating categories. Signed:

*Walter Sudduth*  
 Title: Geotech. Operations Mgr.  
 Date: 1/27/04

